

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 13 are pending. Claim 12 has been canceled.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. This rejection is rendered moot with the above cancellation of claim 12. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are respectively requested.

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,781,976). Claim 13 is somewhat similarly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. in view of Hutchinson et al. (GB 2,331,525). These rejections are traversed.

The present claims are directed to a skin for a seat for a vehicle and require, *inter alia*, "a synthetic resin...wherein when the amount of synthetic resin mixed...is defined as 100 parts, the amount of infrared-ray reflective pigment (7) mixed is in a range from 0.3 parts to 10 parts, and the surface...is a roughened surface having pluralities of recesses and projections (4, 5), and the height (h) of the projections (5) is 0.05 mm or more" (see claims 1 and 6).

As correctly noted in the second paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action, Fujita et al. do not disclose that their "filler is present in the amount of 0.3 parts to 10 parts per 100 parts of synthetic resin." However, the Office Action goes on to assert that "the amount of filler present in the synthetic resin is a result effective variable. For example, as the amount of filler increases, the synthetic resin becomes stronger and has a higher infrared reflectance, thus resistivity, to exposure to the sun."

By the Examiner's reasoning, the more filler added, the better. However, Applicants respectfully note that the present specification unexpectedly demonstrates that "if the amount of infrared-ray reflective pigment exceeds 10 parts, a disadvantage of a plate-out in a producing step will arise" (see page 2, lines 11-13 of the present specification).

Additionally, regarding the height of the projections of 0.05 mm or more, Applicants cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Fujita et al. regarding such projections, let alone the height thereof. As the present specification demonstrates, "[w]hen the skin of the seat has a roughened surface having a plurality of recesses and projections, the sense of a human's skin feeling hot becomes duller than that when the skin of the seat has a flat surface. Therefore, the surface of the skin is formed into a roughened surface having a plurality of recesses and projections dispersed therein. In this case, it is desirable that the height of the projections in the recesses and projections is in a range from 0.05 mm (inclusive) to 0.35 mm (inclusive). However, if the height is less than 0.05 mm, the above-described effect cannot be achieved" (see page 2, lines 15-24, of the present specification). Thus, as Fujita et al. does not teach or suggest such projections or the height of such projections, as well as the above-described unexpected advantages provided thereby, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims would not have been obvious over Fujita et al. for at least these additional reasons.

The Office Action asserts that "Nelson" does not teach such a height but that such a height would be inherent therein because coating will contour the irregularities of the knitted fabric. However, the Office Action has already indicated that the previous

rejection based on U.S. Patent No. 6,194,329 to Nelson was withdrawn. In any case, the Nelson et al. does not appear to be contoured as apparently asserted in the Office Action. Additionally, the present claims require a "roughened surface" not a contoured surface. Although not planar, a contoured surface would still be a "flat" surface, and thus would not be expected to achieve the sense to a human's skin achieved by the "roughened surface" of the presently claimed invention.

Hutchinson et al., which is cited apparently only to show an amine light stabilizer, fails to make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Fujita et al.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 and of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee

deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 107348-00119.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert K. Carpenter
Registration No. 34,794

Customer No. 004372
AREN'T FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810